## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/266,869

Applicant(s)

Taniguchi et al.

Examiner Examiner

Gautam R. Patel

Group Art Unit 2653

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) Gautam R. Patel (3)	
(2) Mr. Brian Tollefson (4)	
Date of Interview Apr 2, 2002	
	's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e)  No. If yes	s, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1, 3 and 171-18	
Identification of prior art discussed:  AAPA and Hoskins	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  It was pointed out that AAPA very clearly indicates what is claimed in the Claim 1, including preamble. Page 1, line 22 to page 2, line 26. Hoskins clearly indicates pseudo-instructions and branch instructions following them. Also claim 1 does not claim branch instruction following the pseudo-instructions.	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).	
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	
	•

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

GAUTAM R. PATEL PATENT EXAMINER ART UNIT 2653